

ON FLUCTUATIONS OF RIEMANN'S ZETA ZEROS

V. KARGIN

Abstract

It is shown that the normalized fluctuations of Riemann's zeta zeros around their predicted locations follow the Gaussian law. It is also shown that fluctuations of two zeros, γ_k and γ_{k+x} , with $x \sim \alpha (\log k)^\beta$, $\beta > 0$, for large k follow the two-variate Gaussian distribution with correlation $(1 - \beta)_+$.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is concerned with the statistical properties of the Riemann zeta function zeros. This subject originated in 1944, when Selberg [15] showed that the number of zeros in a sufficiently long interval on the critical line can be described by the Gaussian law (see also [16], [5], [9], [8]). In the 1970s, Montgomery and Dyson discovered the remarkable fact that the spacings between the zeta zeros resemble the spacings between the eigenvalues of random Hermitian Gaussian matrices. This resemblance was substantiated analytically by Montgomery [11] and supported numerically by Odlyzko [13] (see also [14], [2]). The connection between zeta zeros and random matrix eigenvalues drew much attention, as can be seen for example from review papers in [10]. Recently, Bourgade [1] supported this connection by showing that at the mesoscopic level Riemann's zeros have correlations previously found by Diaconis and Evans [4] for eigenvalues of unitary random matrices.

The motivation for this study comes from a recent paper by Gustavsson [7], who showed that eigenvalues of random Hermitian matrices fluctuate according to the Gaussian law. Our goal is to investigate the statistical fluctuations of Riemann's zeros around their predicted positions and to show that these fluctuations also follow the Gaussian law.

We assume Riemann's hypothesis and denote the non-trivial zeros of Riemann's zeta function by $1/2 + i\gamma_k$. We consider only zeros with positive imaginary part, $\gamma_k > 0$, and order them so that the imaginary part increases, $\gamma_1 \leq \gamma_2 \leq \dots$.

Let $\mathcal{N}(T)$ denote the number of zeros with the imaginary part strictly between 0 and T . If there is a zero with imaginary part equal to T , then we count this zero as $1/2$.

Define

$$S(T) := \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \log \zeta\left(\frac{1}{2} + iT\right),$$

Date: March 2012.

Statistical Laboratory, Department of Mathematics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK. e-mail: v.kargin@statslab.cam.ac.uk.

where the logarithm is calculated by continuous variation along the contour $\sigma + iT$, with σ changing from $+\infty$ to $1/2$.

It is known (see Ch. 15 in [3]) that

$$\mathcal{N}(T) = \frac{T}{2\pi} \log \frac{T}{2\pi e} + \frac{7}{8} + S(T) + O\left(\frac{1}{1+T}\right).$$

Let t_k be the solution of the equation

$$\frac{t}{2\pi} \log \frac{t}{2\pi e} + \frac{7}{8} = k - 1/2,$$

and let

$$\sigma_k := \frac{\sqrt{2 \log \log t_k}}{\log t_k}.$$

Let γ_k denote the imaginary part of the k -th Riemann zero and define

$$f_k = \frac{\gamma_k - t_k}{\sigma_k}. \quad (1)$$

The quantities f_k measure fluctuations of Riemann's zeros from their predicted locations t_k . In order to study the statistical properties of f_k we introduce a probability space $\{\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P}\}$, where $\Omega = [0, 1]$, $\mathcal{B}$ is the σ -algebra of Borel subsets of Ω , and $\mathbb{P}$ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{B}$.

Let us fix $\alpha > 0$ and $\theta \in (1/2, 1]$. We will denote $[\alpha N]$ by K_N , $\lfloor N^\theta \rfloor$ by H_N and the interval of integers $[K_N, K_N + H_N - 1]$ by I_N . We define a sequence of random variables $f^{(N)}$ by the following formula:

$$f^{(N)}(\omega) := f_{k(N, \omega)}, \quad (2)$$

where

$$k(N, \omega) := \lfloor K_N + \omega H_N \rfloor.$$

($\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the largest integer which is less than or equal to x .) Hence $k(N, \omega)$ is a random variable taking its values in integers and uniformly distributed on the interval I_N . Note that

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ f^{(N)} \in (a, b) \right\} = \frac{1}{H_N} |\{k : k \in I_N, f_k \in (a, b)\}|,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left(f^{(N)} \right)^r = \frac{1}{H_N} \sum_{k \in I_N} (f_k)^r.$$

We will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that random variables $f^{(N)}$ are defined as in (2) with parameters $\alpha > 0$ and $1/2 < \theta \leq 1$. Then, for every real ξ , as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ f^{(N)} > \xi \right\} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\xi}^{\infty} e^{-x^2/2} dx.$$

The following simple Corollary of Theorem 1.1 is also useful:

Corollary 1.2. *For every $p \geq 0$,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E \left(f^{(N)} \right)^p = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^p e^{-x^2/2} dx.$$

It is also interesting to ask how f_k and $f_{k'}$ are related when k and k' are sufficiently close to each other. More precisely, define random variables $f_1^{(N)}$ and $f_2^{(N)}$ by the formula:

$$f_i^{(N)}(\omega) = f_{k_i(N, \omega)}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (3)$$

where

$$k_1(N, \omega) = N + \lfloor \omega N \rfloor,$$

$$k_2(N, \omega) = N + \lfloor \omega N \rfloor + \left\lceil \alpha (\log N)^\beta \right\rceil,$$

and $\alpha > 0, \beta > 0$.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that random variables $f_i^{(N)}$ are defined as in (3) with parameters $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$, and suppose that X_1, X_2 are zero-mean Gaussian random variables with $\mathbb{E}(X_i^2) = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}(X_1 X_2) = (1 - \beta)_+$. Then as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

- (i) *the joint cumulative distribution function of $(f_1^{(N)}, f_2^{(N)})$ converges pointwise to the joint cumulative distribution function of (X_1, X_2) , and*
- (ii) *the joint moments of $(f_1^{(N)}, f_2^{(N)})$ converge to the corresponding joint moments of (X_1, X_2) .*

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines the scheme of the proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3. Section 3 introduces some technical tools that we will need in the proof of the main theorems. Section 4 proves a modification of the key approximation result by Selberg. Section 5 calculates the moments of the approximate function S_x . Section 6 calculates the moments of S and concludes the proof of Theorem 1.1. Section 7 proves Theorem 2.3. Section 8 proves Theorem 2.4 and concludes the proof of Theorem 1.3. And Section 9 concludes.

2. OUTLINE OF PROOFS

It is convenient to define

$$X_k := \frac{\sqrt{2\pi} S(t_k + \xi \sigma_k)}{\sqrt{\log \log t_k}},$$

and a corresponding sequence of random variables

$$X^{(N)}(\omega) := X_{k(N, \omega)}. \quad (4)$$

A connection between $X^{(N)}$ and $f^{(N)}$ can be seen as follows. For every real ξ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left\{f^{(N)} > \xi\right\} &= \frac{1}{H_N} |\{k : k \in I_N, \gamma_k > t_k + \xi\sigma_k\}| \\
&= \frac{1}{H_N} |\{k : k \in I_N, \mathcal{N}(t_k + \xi\sigma_k) \leq k - 1/2\}| \\
&= \frac{1}{H_N} \left| \left\{ k : k \in I_N, \frac{t_k + \xi\sigma_k}{2\pi} \log \frac{t_k + \xi\sigma_k}{2\pi e} + \frac{7}{8} + S(t_k + \xi\sigma_k) + O(1/t_k) \leq k - 1/2 \right\} \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{H_N} \left| \left\{ k : k \in I_N, S(t_k + \xi\sigma_k) \leq -\xi \sqrt{\frac{\log \log t_k}{2\pi^2}} \left(1 + \frac{\log 2\pi}{\log t_k}\right) + o(1/t_k) \right\} \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{H_N} \left| \left\{ k : k \in I_N, \frac{\sqrt{2}\pi S(t_k + \xi\sigma_k)}{\sqrt{\log \log t_k}} \leq -\xi \left(1 + \frac{\log 2\pi}{\log t_k}\right) + o(1/t_k) \right\} \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since t_k is asymptotically close to $2\pi k / \log k$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{X^{(N)} \leq -\xi \left(1 + \frac{c_1}{\log N}\right) + o\left(\frac{\log N}{N}\right)\right\} \leq \mathbb{P}\left\{f^{(N)} > \xi\right\} \leq \mathbb{P}\left\{X^{(N)} \leq -\xi \left(1 + \frac{c_2}{\log N}\right) + o\left(\frac{\log N}{N}\right)\right\}. \quad (5)$$

Hence for large N , the distribution of the random variable $f^{(N)}$ is essentially determined by the distribution of the random variable $X^{(N)}$.

In this connection, it is appropriate to recall the following theorem by Selberg (Theorem 3 in [15]). Let

$$X(t) := \frac{\sqrt{2}\pi S(t)}{\sqrt{\log \log t}}.$$

Theorem 2.1 (Selberg). *Assume RH, and let $T^a \leq H \leq T^2$, where $a > 0$. Then for every $k \geq 1$*

$$\frac{1}{H} \int_T^{T+H} |X(t)|^{2k} dt = \frac{2k!}{k!2^k} + O(1/\log \log T),$$

with the constant in the remainder term that depends only on k and a .

In other words, the even moments of the function $X(t)$ behave as the moments of a standard Gaussian variable. This was refined in [5], where it was shown in particular that for every interval I ,

$$\frac{1}{H} \int_T^{T+H} \mathbf{1}_I[X(t)] dt = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_I e^{-x^2/2} dx + o(1),$$

where $\mathbf{1}_I$ denotes the indicator function of interval I . We prove a modified version of this result.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that random variables $X^{(N)}$ are defined as in (4) with parameters $\alpha > 0$ and $1/2 < \theta \leq 1$. Then, for every real ξ , as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, -\xi]}(X^{(N)}) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{-\xi} e^{-x^2/2} dx.$$

Theorem 1.1 immediately follows from Theorem 2.2 and inequalities (5). We will prove Theorem 2.2 by the method of moments, which says that in order to establish the convergence of a sequence of r.v. in distribution to the Gaussian law it is enough to show the convergence of every moment (Example 2.23 on p. 18 in van der Vaart [17]). That is, it is enough to show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(X^{(N)} \right)^r \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^r e^{-x^2/2} dx \quad (6)$$

for every integer $r > 0$. We will show this in Section 6 in Corollary 6.2.

Corollary 1.2 follows because (5) and (6) imply that $(f^{(N)})^{2n}$ are asymptotically uniformly integrable for every $n > 0$ and therefore the moments of $f^{(N)}$ converge to the moments of the limiting Gaussian distribution (see Theorem 2.20 in van der Vaart [17]).

In order to prove Theorem 1.3, define random variables

$$X_i^{(N)}(\omega) := X_{k_i(N, \omega)}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (7)$$

where $k_i(N, \omega)$ are as in (3). Let us use notations

$I_1^{(N)} := [N, 2N - 1]$, $I_2^{(N)} := \left[N + \left\lceil \alpha (\log N)^\beta \right\rceil, 2N - 1 + \left\lceil \alpha (\log N)^\beta \right\rceil \right]$, and $\mathbf{s} := (s_1, s_2)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ f_1^{(N)} > \xi_1, f_2^{(N)} > \xi_2 \right\} &= N^{-2} \left| \left\{ s \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : s_i \in I_i^{(N)}, \gamma_{s_i} > t_{s_i} + \xi_i \sigma_{s_i} \right\} \right| \\ &= N^{-2} \left| \left\{ \mathbf{s} : s_i \in I_i^{(N)}, \mathcal{N}(t_{s_i} + \xi_i \sigma_{s_i}) \leq k_i - 1/2 \right\} \right| \\ &= N^{-2} \left| \left\{ \mathbf{s} : s_i \in I_i^{(N)}, \frac{\sqrt{2\pi} S(t_{s_i} + \xi_i \sigma_{s_i})}{\sqrt{\log \log t_{s_i}}} \leq -\xi_i \left(1 + \frac{\log 2\pi}{\log t_{s_i}} \right) + o(1/t_{s_i}) \right\} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ f_1^{(N)} > \xi_1, f_2^{(N)} > \xi_2 \right\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ X_i^{(N)} \leq -\xi_i \left(1 + \frac{c_1}{\log N} \right) + o\left(\frac{\log N}{N} \right) \right\}, \quad (8)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ f_1^{(N)} > \xi_1, f_2^{(N)} > \xi_2 \right\} \geq \mathbb{P} \left\{ X_i^{(N)} \leq -\xi_i \left(1 + \frac{c_2}{\log N} \right) + o\left(\frac{\log N}{N} \right) \right\}. \quad (9)$$

In words, the joint cumulative distribution function of $f_1^{(N)}$ and $f_2^{(N)}$ approaches that of $X_1^{(N)}$ and $X_2^{(N)}$.

First of all, we have the following result for the random variables $X_1^{(N)}$ and $X_2^{(N)}$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $X_i^{(N)}$ be defined as in (7). Then,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} X_1^{(N)} X_2^{(N)} = (1 - \beta)_+ := \begin{cases} 1 - \beta, & \text{if } \beta \in (0, 1), \\ 0, & \text{if } \beta \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

More generally, the following result holds.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $X_i^{(N)}$ be defined as in (7). Then for every $l, m \geq 0$, $\mathbb{E} \left(X_1^{(N)} \right)^l \left(X_2^{(N)} \right)^m$ converges to $\mathbb{E} (X_1)^l (X_2)^m$ where (X_1, X_2) is a zero-mean Gaussian random variable with $\mathbb{E} (X_i^2) = 1$ and $\mathbb{E} (X_1 X_2) = (1 - \beta)_+$.*

Theorem 2.3 is a particular case of Theorem 2.4. However, we will prove it separately, since its proof is more transparent and shows how the proof of the more general Theorem 2.4 proceeds.

Given Theorem 2.4, we can prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3: Theorem 2.4 implies that the cumulative distribution function of $(X_1^{(N)}, X_2^{(N)})$ converges pointwise to the cumulative distribution function of (X_1, X_2) . The first claim of the theorem follows immediately from this fact and inequalities (8) and (9). In addition, Theorem 2.4 and inequalities (8) and (9) imply that for all integer $a, b \geq 0$, the random variables $(f_1^{(N)})^a (f_2^{(N)})^b$ are asymptotically uniformly integrable. Hence, their expectations converge to the corresponding expectation of the limit, $\mathbb{E}(X_1)^a (X_2)^b$ (by Theorem 2.20 in van der Vaart [17]). This completes the proof of the second claim of the theorem. $\square$

The proof of the convergence of moments of $X^{(N)}$ follows the plan of the argument in Selberg [15].

Recall that $X^{(N)}$ is a rescaled version of $S(g_k)$. The first step in Selberg's proof is to show that $S(t)$ can be approximated by $S_x(t)$, where

$$S_x(t) := -\frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{p \leq x^2} \frac{\sin(t \log p)}{\sqrt{p}}.$$

That is, Selberg shows that

$$\frac{1}{H} \int_K^{K+H} (S(t) - S_x(t))^{2n} dt$$

is small provided that K and H are sufficiently large and that $x \sim K^\varepsilon$ with a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. In our case we will need to modify this result in order to show that the integral can be replaced by a sum over a discrete set of points.

The next step in Selberg's proof is to calculate the moments

$$\frac{1}{H} \int_K^{K+H} |S_x(t)|^{2n} dt.$$

Again it will be necessary to prove a corresponding result for a sum over a discrete set of points.

Given the results in these two steps, it is relatively easy to calculate the moments of $S(t)$. This will be done essentially as in Selberg's paper.

3. EXPONENTIAL SUMS

The changes in Selberg's proof make it necessary to estimate certain exponential sums. The main additional tool that we use to handle these sums is the following theorem by van der Corput (Theorem 2.2 in [6]). Let $e(f(n))$ denote $\exp[2\pi i f(n)]$.

Theorem 3.1 (van der Corput). *Suppose that f is a real valued function with two continuous derivatives on interval I . Suppose also that there is some $\lambda > 0$ and some $\kappa \geq 1$ such that*

$$\lambda \leq |f''(x)| \leq \kappa \lambda$$

on I . Then,

$$\sum_{n \in I} e(f(n)) = O\left(\kappa |I| \lambda^{1/2} + \lambda^{-1/2}\right).$$

In order to apply this theorem in our situation, we need to estimate derivatives of a function $g(x)$ that we are about to define. Let $t(x)$ be the functional inverse of the function

$$x(t) = \frac{t}{2\pi} \log \frac{t}{2\pi e} + \frac{7}{8} \quad (10)$$

on interval $[t_0, \infty)$ where t_0 is sufficiently large. Note that $t(x)$ is an increasing concave function. Let

$$g(x) := t(x) + \xi \frac{\sqrt{2 \log \log t(x)}}{\log t(x)}, \quad (11)$$

where ξ is a real constant. This function is well defined for x greater than some numeric constant x_0 . For x between 0 and x_0 , we define $g(x)$ in an arbitrary fashion such that $g(x)$ has a continuous 3-rd derivative for all $x \geq 0$.

Lemma 3.2. *When $x \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$g''(x) \sim -\frac{2\pi}{x (\log x)^2}$$

and

$$g'''(x) \sim \frac{2\pi}{x^2 (\log x)^2}.$$

Proof: By differentiating

$$x = \frac{t(x)}{2\pi} \log \frac{t(x)}{2\pi e} + \frac{7}{8},$$

we obtain:

$$2\pi = t' \log(t/2\pi), \quad (12)$$

$$t'' = -\frac{(t')^2}{t (\log t/2\pi)}, \quad (13)$$

and

$$t''' = \frac{t'' t' (-3 - \log(t/2\pi))}{t (\log t/2\pi)}. \quad (14)$$

From (10) and (12), we get

$$t \sim 2\pi \frac{x}{\log x} \text{ and } t' \sim 2\pi \frac{1}{\log x},$$

and then (13) and (14) imply that

$$t'' \sim -\frac{2\pi}{x (\log x)^2} \text{ and } t''' \sim \frac{2\pi}{x^2 (\log x)^2}.$$

If

$$h := \frac{\sqrt{\log \log t(x)}}{\log t(x)},$$

then a calculation shows that $h'' = o(t'')$, $h''' = o(t''')$ and therefore

$$g'' \sim -\frac{2\pi}{x(\log x)^2} \text{ and } g''' \sim \frac{2\pi}{x^2(\log x)^2}.$$

□

In the following we will use notation g_k for $g(k)$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let*

$$\theta = \log \left(\frac{p_{l+1} \cdots p_{2n}}{p_1 \cdots p_l} \right),$$

where $1 \leq l \leq 2n$, $\{p_1, \dots, p_l\} \neq \{p_{l+1}, \dots, p_{2n}\}$ and primes $p_i < y$ for all i . Assume $1 \leq H \leq cK$. Then,

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} e^{i\theta g_k} = O \left(Hn \frac{y^{n/2} \log y}{K^{1/2} \log K} + y^{n/2} K^{1/2} \log K \right).$$

Proof: From the assumption, we obtain

$$c/y^n \leq |\theta| \leq 2n \log y.$$

(In order to see the first inequality, let $l \leq n$. Then

$$\left| 1 - \frac{p_{l+1} \cdots p_{2n}}{p_1 \cdots p_l} \right| = \left| \frac{p_1 \cdots p_l - p_{l+1} \cdots p_{2n}}{p_1 \cdots p_l} \right| \geq \frac{1}{y^n}$$

by the uniqueness of integer factorization, and the desired inequality follows. The case $l \geq n$ is similar.)

Hence, by using Lemma 3.2, we find that

$$\lambda \leq |\theta g''(x)| \leq \kappa \lambda$$

with

$$\lambda = \frac{c}{y^n K (\log K)^2},$$

and

$$\kappa = O(ny^n \log y)$$

By applying van der Corput's theorem, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} e^{i\theta g_k} = O \left(Hn \frac{y^{n/2} \log y}{K^{1/2} \log K} + y^{n/2} K^{1/2} \log K \right).$$

□

Lemma 3.4. Suppose $1 \leq c_1 K^\theta \leq H \leq c_2 K$, where $\theta > 1/2$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Let $y \leq K^{\frac{2\theta-1}{3r}-\varepsilon}$, and assume that

$$|\alpha_p| < A \frac{\log p}{\log y} \text{ for } p < y.$$

Then, for every integer $r > 0$, we have

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left| \sum_{p < y} \frac{\alpha_p}{p^{1/2+ig_k}} \right|^{2r} = O(H).$$

Proof: We can write

$$\left(\sum_{p < y} \frac{\alpha_p}{p^{1/2+ig_k}} \right)^r = \sum_{n < y^r} \frac{\beta_n}{n^{1/2+ig_k}},$$

where $\beta_n \leq A^r$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left| \sum_{p < y} \frac{\alpha_p}{p^{1/2+ig_k}} \right|^{2r} &= \sum_{m, n < y^r} \frac{\beta_m \bar{\beta}_n}{\sqrt{mn}} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left(\frac{m}{n} \right)^{ig_k} \\ &\leq H \sum_{n < y^r} \frac{|\beta_n|^2}{n} + 2 \sum_{m < n < y^r} \frac{|\beta_m \beta_n|}{\sqrt{mn}} \left| \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left(\frac{m}{n} \right)^{ig_k} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The first sum can be estimated as follows:

$$\sum_{n < y^r} \frac{|\beta_n|^2}{n} \leq A^r \sum_{n < y^r} \frac{|\beta_n|}{n} \leq A^r \left(\sum_{p < y} \frac{|\alpha_p|}{p} \right)^r = O(1),$$

where we used Mertens' result $\sum_{p < y} \frac{\log p}{p} = O(\log y)$ in the last step.

In order to estimate the second sum we note that

$$1/y^r < \log |n/m| < r \log y;$$

hence we can apply van der Corput's theorem and estimate

$$\left| \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left(\frac{m}{n} \right)^{ig_k} \right| \leq O \left(Hr \frac{y^{r/2} \log y}{K^{1/2} \log K} + y^{r/2} K^{1/2} \log K \right).$$

Besides,

$$\sum_{m < n < y^r} \frac{|\beta_m \beta_n|}{\sqrt{mn}} \leq \left(\sum_{p < y} \frac{\alpha_p}{\sqrt{p}} \right)^{2r} = O(y^r).$$

By assumptions about H and y , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m < n < y^r} \frac{|\beta_m \beta_n|}{\sqrt{mn}} \left| \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left(\frac{m}{n} \right)^{ig_k} \right| &= O(y^r) O \left(Hr \frac{y^{r/2} \log y}{K^{1/2} \log K} + y^{r/2} K^{1/2} \log K \right) \\ &= O(H). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.5. Suppose $1 \leq c_1 K^\theta \leq H \leq c_2 K$, where $\theta > 1/2$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Let $y \leq K^{\frac{2\theta-1}{3r}-\varepsilon}$, and assume that

$$|\alpha_p| < A \text{ for } p < y.$$

Then,

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left| \sum_{p < y} \frac{\alpha_p}{p^{1+ig_k}} \right|^{2r} = O(H).$$

The proof of this lemma is similar to the proof of the previous one.

4. AN ANALOGUE OF SELBERG'S APPROXIMATION FORMULA

Recall that

$$S_x(t) := -\frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{p \leq x^2} \frac{\sin(t \log p)}{\sqrt{p}}.$$

Our immediate goal will be to prove the following result.

Proposition 4.1. Suppose $1 \leq c_1 K^\theta \leq H \leq c_2 K$, where $\theta > 1/2$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Let $x \leq K^{\frac{2\theta-1}{6n}-\varepsilon}$. Then, we have

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)|^{2n} = O(H).$$

Proof: Let $\Lambda(n) = \log p$, if n is a power of the prime number p , and $\Lambda(n) = 0$, otherwise. Also, define

$$\Lambda_x(n) = \begin{cases} \Lambda(n), & \text{for } 1 \leq n \leq x, \\ \Lambda(n) \left(1 - \frac{\log n}{\log x}\right), & \text{for } x \leq n \leq x^2. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1 in [15] states that if $t > 2$, $4 \leq x \leq t^2$, and $\sigma_1 = 1/2 + 1/\log x$, then

$$S(t) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{n < x^2} \frac{\Lambda_x(n)}{n^{\sigma_1}} \frac{\sin(t \log n)}{\log n} + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x} \left| \sum_{n < x^2} \frac{\Lambda_x(n)}{n^{\sigma_1+it}} \right|\right) + O\left(\frac{\log t}{\log x}\right).$$

This gives the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} S(t) - S_x(t) &= O\left(\left| \sum_{p < x^2} \frac{\Lambda(p) - \Lambda_x(p)}{\sqrt{p} \log p} p^{1/2-\sigma_1} p^{-it} \right|\right) \\ &+ O\left(\left| \sum_{p^2 < x^2} \frac{\Lambda_x(p^2)}{p^{2(\sigma_1+it)} \log p} \right|\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x} \left| \sum_{p < x^2} \frac{\Lambda_x(p)}{p^{\sigma_1+it}} \right|\right) \\ &+ O\left(\frac{1}{\log x} \left| \sum_{p^2 < x^2} \frac{\Lambda_x(p^2)}{p^{2(\sigma_1+it)}} \right|\right) + O\left(\sum_{r > 2} \sum_p \frac{1}{r/p^2}\right) \\ &+ O\left(\frac{\log t}{\log x}\right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)|^{2n} &= O \left(\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left| \sum_{p < x^2} \frac{\Lambda(p) - \Lambda_x(p) p^{1/2-\sigma_1}}{\sqrt{p} \log p} p^{-ig_k} \right|^{2n} \right) \\
&+ O \left(\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left| \sum_{p^2 < x^2} \frac{\Lambda_x(p^2)}{p^{2\sigma_1} \log p} p^{-2ig_k} \right|^{2n} \right) \\
&+ O \left(\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left| \sum_{p < x^2} \frac{\Lambda_x(p)}{(\log x) p^{\sigma_1}} p^{-ig_k} \right|^{2n} \right) \\
&+ O \left(\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left| \sum_{p^2 < x^2} \frac{\Lambda_x(p^2)}{(\log x) p^{2\sigma_1}} p^{-2ig_k} \right|^{2n} \right) + O(H).
\end{aligned}$$

By applying Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5, we find that each of the sums on the right-hand side is $O(H)$. For example, for the first term we can apply Lemma 3.4 with

$$\alpha_p = \frac{\Lambda(p) - \Lambda_x(p) p^{1/2-\sigma_1}}{\log p}.$$

The hypothesis of the lemma holds because for $p < x$ we have

$$|\alpha_p| = \left| 1 - e^{-\log p / \log x} \right| \leq A \frac{\log p}{\log x},$$

and for $x \leq p \leq x^2$ the estimate is similar.

This proves that

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)|^{2n} = O(H).$$

□

5. MOMENTS OF $|S_x(t)|$

In the next step we show that the moments of $S_x(t)$ are approximately Gaussian.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose $1 \leq c_1 K^\theta \leq H \leq c_2 K$, where $\theta > 1/2$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Let $x \leq K^{\frac{2\theta-1}{6n}-\varepsilon}$. Then, for every integer $n \geq 1$,*

(i)

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S_x(g_k)|^{2n} = \frac{(2n)!}{(2\pi)^{2n} n!} \left(H (\log \log K)^n + O \left(H (\log \log K)^{n-1} \right) \right),$$

and (ii)

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} S_x(g_k)^{2n-1} = O(H).$$

Proof: First, we can write

$$S_x(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} (\eta - \bar{\eta}),$$

where

$$\eta = \eta(t) = \sum_{p < x^2} p^{-1/2-it}. \quad (15)$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S_x(g_k)|^{2n} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2n}} \sum_{l=0}^{2n} (-1)^{n-l} \binom{2n}{l} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \eta(g_k)^l \bar{\eta}(g_k)^{2n-l}.$$

Here

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \eta(g_k)^l \bar{\eta}(g_k)^{2n-l} = \sum_{p_i < x^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1 \dots p_{2n}}} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left(\frac{p_{l+1} \dots p_{2n}}{p_1 \dots p_l} \right)^{ig_k}.$$

If $\{p_1, \dots, p_l\} \neq \{p_{l+1}, \dots, p_{2n}\}$, then by using Lemma 3.3, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left(\frac{p_{l+1} \dots p_{2n}}{p_1 \dots p_l} \right)^{ig_k} \leq O \left(\left(Hn \frac{x^n \log x}{K^{1/2} \log K} + x^n K^{1/2} \log K \right) \right).$$

Since

$$\sum_{p_i < x^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1 \dots p_{2n}}} = O \left(\left(\sum_{p \leq x^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right)^{2n} \right) = O(x^{2n}),$$

hence in the case $l \neq n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \eta(g_k)^l \bar{\eta}(g_k)^{2n-l} &= O \left(x^{2n} \left(Hn \frac{x^n \log x}{K^{1/2} \log K} + x^n K^{1/2} \log K \right) \right) \\ &= O(H). \end{aligned}$$

If $l = n$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \eta(g_k)^n \bar{\eta}(g_k)^n &= H \sum_{\substack{p < x^2 \\ p_1 \dots p_n = p_{n+1} \dots p_{2n}}} \frac{1}{p_1 \dots p_n} + O(H) \\ &= n!H \left(\sum_{p < x^2} \frac{1}{p} \right)^n + O \left(n!H \sum_{p < x^2} \frac{1}{p_1 \dots p_{n-2} p_n^2} \right) + O(H), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that the number of ways in which a number of the form $p_1 \dots p_n$ can be written as a product of n primes is equal to $n!$ if the primes are all different and less than $n!$ if two or more of the primes are equal. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \eta(g_k)^n \bar{\eta}(g_k)^n &= n!H (\log \log x)^n + O \left(n!H (\log \log x)^{n-1} \right) \\ &= n!H (\log \log K)^n + O \left(n!H (\log \log K)^{n-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S_x(g_k)|^{2n} &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2n}} \sum_{l=0}^{2n} (-1)^{n-l} \binom{2n}{l} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \eta(g_k)^l \bar{\eta}(g_k)^{2n-l} \\ &= \frac{(2n)!}{(2\pi)^{2n} n!} \left(H (\log \log K)^n + O \left(H (\log \log K)^{n-1} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (ii) is similar, except that in this case it is always true that $\{p_1, \dots, p_l\} \neq \{p_{l+1}, \dots, p_{2n-1}\}$. $\square$

6. MOMENTS OF $|S(t)|$ AND CONCLUSION OF THE PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose $1 \leq c_1 K^\theta \leq H \leq c_2 K$, where $\theta > 1/2$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Then, for every integer $n \geq 1$,*

(i)

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S(g_k)|^{2n} = \frac{(2n)!}{(2\pi)^{2n} n!} \left(H (\log \log K)^n + O \left(H (\log \log K)^{n-1/2} \right) \right),$$

and (ii)

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} (S(g_k))^{2n-1} = O \left(H (\log \log K)^{n-1} \right).$$

Proof: Take $x = K^{\frac{2\theta-1}{6n}-\varepsilon}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |S(g_k)|^{2n} &= |S_x(g_k) + (S(g_k) - S_x(g_k))|^{2n} \\ &= |S_x(g_k)|^{2n} + O \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^{2n} |S_x(g_k)|^{2n-\nu} |S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)|^\nu \right). \end{aligned}$$

By using the Hölder inequality, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S_x(g_k)|^{2n-\nu} |S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)|^\nu &\leq \left(\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S_x(g_k)|^{2n} \right)^{1-\nu/2n} \left(\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)|^{2n} \right)^{\nu/2n} \\ &= O \left([H (\log \log K)^n]^{1-\nu/2n} H^{\nu/2n} \right) = O \left(H (\log \log K)^{n-1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S(g_k)|^{2n} = \frac{(2n)!}{(2\pi)^{2n} n!} \left(H (\log \log K)^n + O \left(H (\log \log K)^{n-1/2} \right) \right).$$

For the proof of (ii), we estimate

$$S(g_k)^{2n-1} - S_x(g_k)^{2n-1} = O \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^{2n-1} |S_x(g_k)|^{2n-1-\nu} |S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)|^\nu \right),$$

and note that

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S_x(g_k)|^{2n-1-\nu} |S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)|^\nu \leq \left(\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S_x(g_k)|^{2n} \right)^{\frac{2n-1-\nu}{2n}} \left(\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)|^{\frac{\nu}{1+\nu} 2n} \right)^{\frac{1+\nu}{2n}},$$

where we used the Hölder inequality with $p = 2n/(2n - 1 - \nu)$ and $q = 2n/(1 + \nu)$. Next, we use the inequality

$$\left| \frac{1}{H} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)|^{\frac{\nu}{1+\nu} 2n} \right|^{\frac{1+\nu}{\nu} \frac{1}{2n}} \leq \left| \frac{1}{H} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)|^{2n} \right|^{\frac{1}{2n}} = O(1)$$

in order to conclude that

$$\left| \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)|^{\frac{\nu}{1+\nu} 2n} \right|^{\frac{1+\nu}{2n}} \leq O\left(H^{\frac{1+\nu}{2n}}\right).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S_x(g_k)|^{2n-1-\nu} |S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)|^\nu &= O\left(H^{\frac{2n-1-\nu}{2n}} (\log \log K)^{n-\frac{1+\nu}{2}} H^{\frac{1+\nu}{2n}}\right) \\ &= O\left(H (\log \log K)^{n-\frac{1+\nu}{2}}\right) = O\left(H (\log \log K)^{n-1}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq \nu \leq 2n - 1$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} S(g_k)^{2n-1} &= \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} S_x(g_k)^{2n-1} + O\left(H (\log \log K)^{n-1}\right) \\ &= O\left(H (\log \log K)^{n-1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 6.2. Suppose $1 \leq c_1 K^\theta \leq H \leq c_2 K$, where $\theta > 1/2$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Then, (i)

$$\frac{1}{H} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left| \frac{\sqrt{2\pi} S(t_k + \xi \sigma_k)}{\sqrt{\log \log t_k}} \right|^{2n} = \frac{(2n)!}{(2\pi)^{2n} n!} \left(1 + O\left((\log \log K)^{-1/2}\right)\right),$$

and (ii)

$$\frac{1}{H} \sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \left(\frac{\sqrt{2\pi} S(t_k + \xi \sigma_k)}{\sqrt{\log \log t_k}} \right)^{2n-1} = O\left((\log \log K)^{-1/2}\right),$$

This Corollary implies Theorem 1.1.

7. COVARIANCE

Lemma 7.1. Let primes $p_1 \neq p_2 < y \leq cK$. Assume $1 \leq H \leq cK$, and let $k' = k + x$, where $0 < x < K^\varepsilon$, with $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$. Then,

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} \exp(-i(g_k \log p_1 - g_{k'} \log p_2)) = O\left(H \frac{y^{1/2} \log y}{K^{1/2} \log K} + y^{1/2} K^{1/2} \log K\right).$$

Proof: By using Lemma 3.2, we can estimate:

$$g''(t) \log p_1 - g''(t+x) \log p_2 = \frac{-2\pi}{t(\log t)^2} (\log p_1 - \log p_2) + o\left(\frac{\log y}{t(\log t)^2}\right) + o\left(\frac{x \log y}{t^2}\right).$$

It follows that

$$|g''(t) \log p_1 - g''(t+x) \log p_2| \geq c \frac{1}{yK(\log K)^2},$$

and

$$|g''(t) \log p_1 - g''(t+x) \log p_2| \leq cy \log y \frac{1}{yK(\log K)^2}.$$

The conclusion of the lemma follows by applying Theorem 3.1. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.3: In order to compute $\mathbb{E}X_1^{(N)}X_2^{(N)}$, we proceed as above in the calculation of $\mathbb{E}\left(X_1^{(N)}\right)^2$.

Since by Proposition 4.1,

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} |S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)|^{2n} = O(H),$$

therefore, it is essential to compute

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} S_x(g_k) S_x(g_{k'}),$$

where $k' = k + \alpha(\log N)^\beta$. By using function η , defined in (15), we obtain:

$$\sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} S_x(g_k) S_x(g_{k'}) = -\frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} (\eta(g_k) \eta(g_{k'}) - \eta(g_k) \bar{\eta}(g_{k'}) - \bar{\eta}(g_k) \eta(g_{k'}) + \bar{\eta}(g_k) \bar{\eta}(g_{k'})).$$

For the first term in this sum, we write

$$\sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} \eta(g_k) \eta(g_{k'}) = \sum_{p_1, p_2 \leq x^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1 p_2}} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} p_1^{-ig_k} p_2^{-ig_{k'}}.$$

Note that the sum

$$\sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} p_1^{-ig_k} p_2^{-ig_{k'}} = \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} \exp[-i(g_k \log p_1 + g_{k+\alpha(\log N)^\beta} \log p_2)]$$

is an exponential sum, and it can be estimated by using van der Corput's theorem by noticing that the second derivative of the function

$$g(s) \log p_1 + g\left(s + \alpha(\log N)^\beta\right) \log p_2$$

is bounded by $O\left(N^{-1}(\log N)^{-2}\right)$ from below and by $O\left(N^{-1}(\log N)^{-2} \log x\right)$ from above.

This implies that with an appropriate choice of x ,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} \eta(g_k) \eta(g_{k'}) = O(1),$$

and similar for $N^{-1} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} \bar{\eta}(g_k) \bar{\eta}(g_{k'})$.

Therefore

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} S_x(g_k) S_x(g_{k'}) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \operatorname{Re} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} \eta(g_k) \bar{\eta}(g_{k'}) \right] + O(1),$$

where

$$\sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} \eta(g_k) \bar{\eta}(g_{k'}) = \sum_{p_1, p_2 \leq x^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1 p_2}} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} p_1^{-ig_k} p_2^{ig_{k'}}.$$

If $p_1 \neq p_2$, then by using Lemma 7.1, we can estimate

$$\sum_{p_1, p_2 \leq x^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1 p_2}} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} p_1^{-ig_k} p_2^{ig_{k'}} = O\left(x^3 N^{1/2} \log N\right) = O(N),$$

provided that $x = N^\kappa$ and $\kappa \leq 1/6$.

If $p_1 = p_2$, then we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} \sum_{p \leq x^2} \frac{1}{p} p^{-i(g_k - g_{k'})}$$

If one sets $x = N^\kappa$, then by using the definition of function g , it is easy to see that for every $k \in [N, 2N-1]$, and $k' = k + c(\log N)^\beta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_{k'} - g_k &= 2\pi c(\log N)^{\beta-1} + O\left((\log N)^{\beta-2}\right) \\ &= \left(2\pi c/\kappa^{\beta-1}\right) (\log x)^{\beta-1} + O\left((\log x)^{\beta-2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant in the O -term does not depend on k .

Hence, by using the result of Lemma 7.2 below we find that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} \sum_{p \leq x^2} \frac{1}{p} p^{-i(g_k - g_{k'})} = (1 - \beta)_+ \log \log x + O(1).$$

It follows that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} S_x(g_k) S_x(g_{k'}) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} (1 - \beta)_+ \log \log x + O(1).$$

Next we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} S(g_k) S(g_{k'}) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} S_x(g_k) S_x(g_{k'}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} S_x(g_k) (S(g_{k'}) - S_x(g_{k'})) \\
&+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} (S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)) S_x(g_{k'}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} (S(g_k) - S_x(g_k)) (S(g_{k'}) - S_x(g_{k'})).
\end{aligned}$$

By the Schwarz inequality, the last three terms can be estimated as $(\log \log N)^{1/2}$, and therefore we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=N}^{2N-1} S(g_k) S(g_{k'}) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} (1 - \beta)_+ \log \log x + O\left((\log \log x)^{1/2}\right),$$

This implies that

$$\mathbb{E} X_1^{(N)} X_2^{(N)} = (1 - \beta)_+.$$

□

Lemma 7.2. Suppose that $s(x) = c(\log x)^{\beta-1} + O\left((\log x)^{\beta-2}\right)$, where $\beta > 0$. Then,

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} p^{is(x)} = (1 - \beta)_+ \log \log x + O(1).$$

Proof: Note that

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} p^{is(x)} = \sum_{n \leq x} n^{-1+is(x)} [\pi(n) - \pi(n-1)],$$

where $\pi(t)$ is the counting function for primes: $\pi(t) = |\{p : p \leq t\}|$. Hence, by partial summation,

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} p^{is(x)} = \pi(x) x^{-1+is(x)} - (-1 + is(x)) \int_3^x \pi(t) t^{-2+is(x)} dt + O(1).$$

By using the estimate

$$\pi(t) = \frac{t}{\log t} + O\left(\frac{t}{(\log t)^2}\right),$$

we obtain

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} p^{is(x)} = (1 - is(x)) \int_3^x \frac{e^{is(x) \log t}}{t \log t} dt + O(1).$$

Now, let us estimate the integral:

$$\int_3^x \frac{e^{is(x) \log t}}{t \log t} dt = \int_{\log 3}^{\log x} \frac{e^{is(x)u}}{u} du = \int_{s(x) \log 3}^{s(x) \log x} \frac{e^{iv}}{v} dv.$$

If $\beta \geq 1$, then we can use the estimate

$$\left| \int_x^\infty \frac{e^{iv}}{v} dv \right| = O\left(\frac{1}{x}\right),$$

and conclude that

$$\int_3^x \frac{e^{is(x) \log t}}{t \log t} dt = O\left(\frac{1}{s(x)}\right).$$

If $\beta \in (0, 1)$, then

$$\int_{s(x) \log 3}^{s(x) \log x} \frac{e^{iv}}{v} dv = \int_{s(x) \log 3}^1 \frac{e^{iv}}{v} dv + \int_1^{s(x) \log x} \frac{e^{iv}}{v} dv.$$

(Note that $s(x) \log x \rightarrow \infty$ by assumption that $\beta > 0$.) The second integral is bounded uniformly in x . For the first integral we note that

$$\int_{s(x) \log 3}^1 \frac{e^{iv} - 1}{v} dv = O(1),$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{s(x) \log 3}^1 \frac{e^{iv}}{v} dv &= \int_{s(x) \log 3}^1 \frac{1}{v} dv + O(1) \\ &= -\log s(x) + O(1) \\ &= (1 - \beta) \log \log x + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

So, if $0 < \beta < 1$, then we find that

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} p^{is(x)} = (1 - \beta) \log \log x + O(1).$$

If $\beta \geq 1$, then we find that

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} p^{is(x)} = O(1).$$

□

8. JOINT MOMENTS

Proof of Theorem 2.4: It is clearly enough to prove the corresponding result for random variables $S(g_{k_1})$ and $S(g_{k_2})$ since $X_i^{(N)}$ are the rescaled versions of these random variables. In fact, as a consequence of the Selberg approximation result, it is enough to show that $S_x(g_{k_1})$ and $S_x(g_{k_2})$ have the required moments.

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
S(g_{k_1})^a S(g_{k_2})^b &= (S_x(g_{k_1}) + S(g_{k_1}) - S_x(g_{k_1}))^a (S_x(g_{k_2}) + S(g_{k_2}) - S_x(g_{k_2}))^b \\
&= S_x(g_{k_1})^a S_x(g_{k_2})^b \\
&\quad + O\left(\sum_{s,t} S_x(g_{k_1})^s (S(g_{k_1}) - S_x(g_{k_1}))^{a-s} S_x(g_{k_2})^t (S(g_{k_2}) - S_x(g_{k_2}))^{b-t}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the sum is over s and t such that $0 \leq s \leq a$, $0 \leq t \leq b$, and $s + t < a + b$.

After we sum over k_1 and apply the Schwartz inequality twice, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k_1=N}^{2N-1} \left(S(g_{k_1})^a S(g_{k_2})^b - S_x(g_{k_1})^a S_x(g_{k_2})^b \right) \\
&= O\left(\sum_{s,t} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k_1=N}^{2N-1} S_x(g_{k_1})^{4s} \right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k_1=N}^{2N-1} S_x(g_{k_2})^{4t} \right)^{1/4} \right. \\
&\quad \times \left. \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k_1=N}^{2N-1} (S(g_{k_1}) - S_x(g_{k_1}))^{4(a-s)} \right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k_1=N}^{2N-1} (S(g_{k_1}) - S_x(g_{k_1}))^{4(a-s)} \right)^{1/4} \right) \\
&= O\left((\log \log N)^{(a+b-1)/2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, if variables S and S_x are scaled by $(\log \log N)^{-1}$, the difference in their moments is of order $(\log \log N)^{-1/2}$.

The result about moments of the scaled versions of $S_x(g_{k_1})$ and $S_x(g_{k_2})$ follows from the result for random variables

$$\eta_i^{(N)} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log \log N}} \eta(g_{k_i(N, \omega)}),$$

where $i = 1, 2$, and $\eta(t)$ is as defined in (15).

Theorem 8.1. *Let $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 \geq 0$. The joint moments of random variables $\eta_1^{(N)}$ and $\eta_2^{(N)}$,*

$$m_N(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2) := \mathbb{E} \left(\eta_1^{(N)} \right)^{a_1} \left(\overline{\eta_1^{(N)}} \right)^{a_2} \left(\eta_2^{(N)} \right)^{b_1} \left(\overline{\eta_2^{(N)}} \right)^{b_2},$$

converge to the corresponding joint moments of complex Gaussian random variables η_1 and η_2 , which have the following covariance structure: $\mathbb{E} \eta_i^2 = \mathbb{E} \overline{\eta_i^2} = \mathbb{E} \eta_1 \eta_2 = \mathbb{E} \overline{\eta_1} \overline{\eta_2} = 0$, $\mathbb{E} \eta_i \overline{\eta_i} = 1$, $\mathbb{E} \eta_1 \overline{\eta_2} = \mathbb{E} \overline{\eta_1} \eta_2 = (1 - \beta)_+$.

Indeed, if this result holds, then the joint moments of (real) random variables

$$S_x(g_{k_j}) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\eta_j^{(N)} - \overline{\eta_j^{(N)}} \right)$$

converge to the corresponding joint moments of Gaussian random variables S_1 and S_2 , where

$$E(S_1^2) = E(S_2^2) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2},$$

and

$$E(S_1 S_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} (1 - \beta)_+.$$

This implies the statement of Theorem 2.4.

Before attacking Theorem 8.1, let us recall the Wick Rule for the joint moments of Gaussian random variables, namely,

$$\mathbb{E}[x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_k}] = \sum_{\pi \in P_2(\{1, \dots, k\})} \prod_{(r,s) \in \pi} \mathbb{E}[x_{i_r} x_{i_s}],$$

where the sum is over all pairings of indices $1, \dots, k$. (In particular, if k is odd, then the sum is empty.) (See, for example, Theorem 22.3 in [12] or Appendix 1 on p. 13 in [18]).

If we apply this rule to random variables $\eta_i, \bar{\eta}_i$, then we find that

$$m(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2) := \mathbb{E}(\eta_1)^{a_1} (\bar{\eta}_1)^{a_2} (\eta_2)^{b_1} (\bar{\eta}_2)^{b_2}$$

is zero unless $a_1 + b_1 = a_2 + b_2$. If $a_1 + b_1 = a_2 + b_2$, then

$$m(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2) = n(k, a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2) (1 - \beta)_+^k, \quad (16)$$

where $n(k, a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2)$ is a number of ways to pair a_1 elements η_1 and b_1 elements η_2 with a_2 elements $\bar{\eta}_1$ and b_2 elements $\bar{\eta}_2$ so that exactly k elements are connected with an element that has a different index.

Also, we need a generalization of Lemma 3.3.

Lemma 8.2. *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &= g(x) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{a_2} \log q_k - \sum_{k=1}^{a_1} \log p_k \right) \\ &\quad + g(x+u) \left(\sum_{k=a_2+1}^{a_2+b_2} \log q_k - \sum_{k=a_1+1}^{a_1+b_1} \log p_k \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $g(x)$ is as defined in (11), $\{p_1, \dots, p_{a_1+b_1}\} \neq \{q_1, \dots, q_{a_2+b_2}\}$ and primes p_i and q_i are less than $y \leq K^\varepsilon$ for all i and $\varepsilon < 1/n$. Assume $1 \leq H \leq cK$ and $u \leq \alpha(\log K)^\beta$. Let $n = \lfloor (a_1 + a_2 + b_1 + b_2)/2 \rfloor$. Then,

$$\sum_{k=K}^{K+H-1} e^{ih(k)} = O \left(H \frac{y^{n/2} \log y}{K^{1/2} \log K} + y^{n/2} K^{1/2} \log K \right).$$

Proof: We can re-write the definition of $h(x)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &= h_1(x) + h_2(x) = g(x) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{a_2+b_2} \log q_k - \sum_{k=1}^{a_1+b_1} \log p_k \right) \\ &\quad + (g(x+u) - g(x)) \left(\sum_{k=a_2+1}^{a_2+b_2} \log q_k - \sum_{k=a_1+1}^{a_1+b_1} \log p_k \right). \end{aligned}$$

The second derivative of the first term can be estimated as in Lemma 3.3: If $x \in [K, K + H]$, then

$$h_1''(x) \in [\lambda, \kappa\lambda],$$

where

$$\lambda = \frac{c_1}{y^n K (\log K)^2} \text{ and } \kappa = c_2 y^n \log y.$$

For the second term, we note that

$$(g(x+u) - g(x))'' = g'''(\theta)u,$$

where $\theta \in [x, x+u]$, and by using Lemma 3.2 we find that

$$h_2''(x) = O\left(\frac{(\log K)^{\beta-2}}{K^2} \log y\right) = o(h_1''(x)),$$

provided that $y \leq K^\varepsilon$ with $\varepsilon < 1/n$. It follows that $h''(x) \sim h_1''(x)$, and the conclusion of the lemma follows by an application of Theorem 3.1 as in Lemma 3.3. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 8.1: By definition, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\eta_1^{(N)} \right)^{a_1} \left(\overline{\eta_1^{(N)}} \right)^{a_2} \left(\eta_2^{(N)} \right)^{b_1} \left(\overline{\eta_2^{(N)}} \right)^{b_2} &= \frac{1}{N (\log \log N)^{(a_1+a_2+b_1+b_2)/2}} \\ &\times \sum_{k_1=N}^{2N-1} \left(\sum_{p \leq x^2} \frac{p^{-ig_{k_1}}}{\sqrt{p}} \right)^{a_1} \left(\sum_{q \leq x^2} \frac{q^{ig_{k_1}}}{\sqrt{q}} \right)^{a_2} \\ &\times \left(\sum_{p \leq x^2} \frac{p^{-ig_{k_2}}}{\sqrt{p}} \right)^{b_1} \left(\sum_{q \leq x^2} \frac{q^{ig_{k_2}}}{\sqrt{q}} \right)^{b_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $k_2 = k_1 + \lceil \alpha (\log N)^\beta \rceil$. If we expand the product of sums, we get for a general term

$$t(p, p', q, q') := \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1 \dots p_{a_1+b_1} q_1 \dots q_{a_2+b_2}}} \frac{(q_1 \dots q_{a_2})^{ig_{k_1}} (q_{a_2+1} \dots q_{a_2+b_2})^{ig_{k_2}}}{(p_1 \dots p_{a_1})^{ig_{k_1}} (p_{a_1+1} \dots p_{a_1+b_1})^{ig_{k_2}}},$$

where $p := (p_1, \dots, p_{a_1})$, $p' := (p_{a_1+1}, \dots, p_{a_1+a_2})$, $q := (q_1, \dots, q_{b_1})$, and $q' := (q_{b_1+1}, \dots, q_{b_1+b_2})$.

By using Lemma 8.2, we find that after we sum this term over k_1 and divide it by $N (\log \log N)^{(a_1+a_2+b_1+b_2)/2}$, we get a non-negligible contribution if and only if there is a pairing that puts every q_i in a correspondence with a p_j , so that $q_i = p_j$. In particular, it must be true that $a_1 + b_1 = a_2 + b_2 = n$. Hence, the moment is asymptotically equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{N (\log \log N)^n} \sum_{k_1=N}^{2N-1} \sum_{p \cdot p' = q \cdot q'} t(p, p', q, q'), \quad (17)$$

where $p \cdot p'$ denotes the product of primes in p and p' , and similar for $q \cdot q'$. If we consider the sum over all (p, p') , in which at least one p_i appears twice, then we can see that this sum can

be estimated as

$$O \left(\sum_{k_1=N}^{2N-1} \left(\sum_{p \leq x^2} \frac{1}{p^2} \right) \left(\sum_{p \leq x^2} \frac{1}{p} \right)^{n-2} \right) = O(N (\log \log N)^{n-2}),$$

which gives a negligible contribution to the moment.

Otherwise, if every prime appears only once in (p, p') and if $p \cdot p' = q \cdot q'$, then there is a unique pairing between elements of (p, p') and (q, q') . Let this pairing be called π . That is, $\pi(i) = j$ means that $p_i = q_j$.

The terms that satisfy pairing π give the following contribution to the sum in (17):

$$\sum_{k_1=N}^{2N-1} \left(\sum_{p \leq x^2} \frac{1}{p} \right)^{n_{11}+n_{22}} \left(\sum_{p \leq x^2} \frac{p^{i(g_{k_1}-g_{k_2})}}{p} \right)^{n_{12}} \left(\sum_{p \leq x^2} \frac{p^{-i(g_{k_1}-g_{k_2})}}{p} \right)^{n_{21}} + O(N (\log \log N)^{n-2}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} n_{11} &= |\{i, j : \pi(i) = j, 1 \leq i \leq a_2, 1 \leq j \leq a_1\}|, \\ n_{12} &= |\{i, j : \pi(i) = j, 1 \leq i \leq a_2, a_1 \leq j \leq a_1 + b_1\}|, \end{aligned}$$

and so on.

By Lemma 7.2, this can be computed as

$$((1 - \beta)_+)^{n_{12}+n_{21}} N (\log \log N)^n + O(N (\log \log N)^{n-1}).$$

After summing over all pairings we find that the moment equals

$$\sum_{\pi} ((1 - \beta)_+)^{n_{12}+n_{21}} + O((\log \log N)^{-1}).$$

Recall $n(k, a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2)$ is a number of ways to pair a_1 elements η_1 and b_1 elements η_2 with a_2 elements $\bar{\eta}_1$ and b_2 elements $\bar{\eta}_2$ so that exactly k elements are connected with an element that has a different index. That is, $n(k, a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2)$ is the number of pairings π for which $n_{12} + n_{21} = k$.

It follows that asymptotically, the moment tends to $n(k, a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2) (1 - \beta)_+^k$, which is exactly the corresponding joint moment of the Gaussian variables that we obtained in formula (16). $\square$

9. CONCLUSION

We have shown that the distribution of two zeta zero fluctuations approaches a two-variate Gaussian distribution. It is natural to expect that the distribution of any finite number of fluctuations approaches a multivariate Gaussian distribution with the covariance matrix $\mathbb{E}X_i X_j = (1 - \beta_{ij})_+$, where

$$\beta_{ij} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |k_j(N, \omega) - k_i(N, \omega)|}{\log \log N},$$

and the limit is assumed to be positive and the same for all ω . (The fluctuations are around the predicted locations $t_{k_i(N, \omega)}$, and $k_i(N, \omega)$ are defined as in (3) with appropriate changes.)

The proof should proceed similarly to the proof of the result for two fluctuations; however, the notation becomes more cumbersome.

The positive numbers β_{ij} in the covariance matrix are not arbitrary but satisfy the ultrametric inequality:

$$\beta_{ik} \leq \max \{ \beta_{ij}, \beta_{jk} \}.$$

More about processes with these finite-dimensional distributions can be found in Section 4 of [1].

REFERENCES

- [1] Paul Bourgade. Mesoscopic fluctuations of the zeta zeros. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 148:479–500, 2010.
- [2] Marc Coram and Persi Diaconis. New tests of the correspondence between unitary eigenvalues and the zeros of Riemann's zeta function. *Journal of Physics A: mathematical and general*, 36:2883–2906, 2003.
- [3] H. Davenport. *Multiplicative Number Theory*. Markham Publishing Co., 1967.
- [4] Persi Diaconis and Steven N. Evans. Linear functionals of eigenvalues of random matrices. *Transactions of American Mathematical Society*, 353(7):2615–2633, 2001.
- [5] Amit Ghosh. On the Riemann zeta function – mean value theorems and the distribution of $|S(t)|$. *Journal of Number Theory*, 17:93–102, 1983.
- [6] S. W. Graham and G. Kolesnik. *Van der Corput's Method of Exponential Sums*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [7] Jonas Gustavsson. Gaussian fluctuations of eigenvalues in the GUE. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probability and Statistics*, 41:151–178, 2005.
- [8] C. P. Hughes, A. Nikeghbali, and M. Yor. An arithmetic model for the total disorder process. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 141:47–59, 2008.
- [9] W. D. Joyner. *Distribution Theorems of L-functions*, volume 142 of *Pitman Research Notes*. 1986.
- [10] F. Mezzadri and N. C. Snaith, editors. *Recent Perspectives in Random Matrix Theory and Number Theory*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes.
- [11] H. L. Montgomery. The pair correlation of the zeta function. *Proc. Symp. Pure Math*, 24:181–193, 1973.
- [12] Alexandru Nica and Roland Speicher. Lectures on the combinatorics of free probability. volume 335 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [13] A. M. Odlyzko. On the distribution of spacings between zeros of the zeta function. *Math. Comp.*, 48:273–308, 1987.
- [14] Zeev Rudnick and Peter Sarnak. Zeros of principal L-functions and random matrix theory. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 81:269–322, 1996.
- [15] A. Selberg. On the remainder in the formula for $N(T)$, the number of zeros of $\zeta(s)$ in the strip $0 < t < T$. In *Collected papers of A. Selberg*, volume 1, pages 179–203. 1944. The year of the original publication is 1944.
- [16] A. Selberg. Contributions to the theory of Dirichlet's L-functions. In *Collected papers of A. Selberg*, volume 1, pages 281–340. 1946. The year of the original publication is 1946.
- [17] A. W. van der Vaart. *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [18] A. Zee. *Quantum Field Theory in a Nutshell*. Princeton University Press, 2003.